



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,440	09/16/2003	Hiroichi Ukei	Q77488	9838
23373	7590	01/10/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ZIRKER, DANIEL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,440

Applicant(s)

UKEI ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Zirker

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1771

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, it should first be noted that dependent claim 3 is broader than claim 1 and dependent claim 4 is a duplicate of claim 1. Additionally, it is not clear to the Examiner how the two performance parameters found in lines 5-6 of claim 1 are connected to the remaining claim structure; i.e. the language chosen still appears to be vague and indefinite due to the lack of suitable antecedent basis which currently exists in the claim.

3. The specification is objected to under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention, substantially for the reasons set forth in Paragraph No. 4 of Paper No. 041804 mailed 5/2/05, together with the following additional observations. More particularly, while it is noted that while each of the four referred to Examples or Comparative Examples do have, as applicants state, *slightly* differing densities (note again the Examiner's statement that the various comparative embodiments "are formed from **virtually the identical blend** of LDPE and HDPE in a ratio 70% LDPE/ 30% HDPE as that of Example 2") this is again seen to be clearly inadequate as a basis for explaining the substantially differing quality of the results obtained and thus for the basis of an effective traversal of the Examiner's rejection.

Art Unit: 1771

Since applicants present no additional arguments in support of their position the Examiner can only again conclude that they have failed to meet the "how to make" requirement of the statute for reasons already of record.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as being based upon a non-enabling disclosure.
5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Chang or Brown et al '957, each taken in view of Ishikawa et al, substantially for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 9 and 10 of Paper No. mailed 5/2/05, together with the following additional observations. Both of the primary references teach the use of polyolefin based films, i.e. either polyethylene and/or polypropylene, so there is ample motivation to combine with Ishikawa et al which teaches (Col 4, lines 12-18) a variety of polyolefin based copolymer compositions which can encompass such polymer film blends as applicants' claim. Additionally note that both Ishikawa et al (e.g. Col 4, lines 66-68) as well as Brown et al (Example 1 @ Col 4, lines 35-39) teach the use of fillers in the film layer, the exact amount of which is believed to be a routine optimization for one of ordinary skill, if not already disclosed (Brown et al). With respect to applicants' remarks (Response, page 9, 2nd paragraph note that while Brown et al teaches an elongation amount of only 40-80% it must be noted that this measurement is made when polypropylene is the material from which the plastic film of Brown et al is made, not the HDPE/LDPE film of the relied upon prior art combination.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1771

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is 571-272-1486. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on 571 – 272 - 1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1771

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Zirker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1771

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel Zirker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'D' and 'Z'.